

**REMARKS**

In the Action, the Examiner stated that claims 11-14 may be later objected to as substantially duplicative of claims 7-10 should claims 7-10 be found to be allowable. Claim 11, as amended, recites “generating at the server one or more HTML files based on one or more XSL files” and “selecting and transmitting HTML content.” Applicant submits that neither of these features are required by claims 7-10.

Claim 1 stands rejected over the combination of Blackketter in view of Shintani. Applicant respectfully submits that Shintani is not prior art with respect to this application. Shintani was filed on January 16, 2001, and makes no priority claim. The pending application was filed on August 20, 2001 and claims priority to the four provisional applications identified in the Cross Reference to Related Applications.

U.S. Provisional Application Serial No. 60/227,062, filed on August 21, 2000, and to which priority is claimed, provides support for all of the features of at least claim 1 in the pending application. The ‘062 application describes that “the present invention causes a trigger having the uniform resource locator (URL) of the above-indicated ‘index\_acs.htm’ file to be imbedded in the video data sent to the STB associated with the presentation platform” (page 3, lines 15-17). Fig. 1 of the ‘062 application illustrates insertion and broadcast of an ‘Interactive TV Link’ which is sent to the STB. Fig. 1 also illustrates that a user clicks on an icon and the index\_acs.htm file having JavaScript code that determines the STB and transfers control to the appropriate page.

The provisional application further describes that “in the present invention, each page includes a client sniffer code for ascertaining the proper HTML/Javascript programming required to supply the proper triggers and HTML data to the particular STB for proper operation of the enhanced content code” (page 2, lines 20-22). “By selecting the icon presented by the particular STB, that is, should the user click on the icon, the STB will be directed to download via an internet connection, i.e., the ‘Transport A’ industry standard for providing graphical content to a

presentation platform, the web page index\_acs.htm whereby the HTML/Javascript coding requirements for the associated STB can be determined” (page 3, lines 20-24). “The index\_acs.htm web page has Javascript code in its window onload event that programmatically ‘sniffs’ itself, that is it utilizes program logic to determine if it is detecting WebTV, AOLTV, or some other STB having a different logic requirement (page 3, lines 28-30).

The portions of the provisional application described above are only exemplary. Support for the pending claims may be also found elsewhere in the ‘062 application and in the other provisional applications to which priority is claimed.

Applicant further submits that the combination of Blackketter and Shintani fails to disclose the features of claim 7 of “decoding a signal header at said server to establish said set-top box type” and “based on the decoded signal header, establishing said set-top box type;” fails to disclose the features of claim 11 of “decoding a signal header at said server to establish said set-top box type” and “selecting and transmitting HTML content corresponding to said type of said set-top box;” and fails to disclose the features of claim 15 of “a signal containing header information conveying type and location information of said set-top box.”

Blackketter is directed to a television trigger that indicates a future time when the trigger is to be executed. Shintani is directed to an interactive television system that uses a cache memory to mirror pages associated with a URL embedded within the interactive content. Neither are of particular relevance to the claimed invention.

In the Action, the Examiner identified paragraph [0015] of Shintani. Paragraph [0015] describes that an STB can have its own URL or IP address or other unique identifier assigned to it for addressability by a head end. Applicant submits that simple addressability of a STB does not identify the “type” of STB. The specification at page 14, lines 4-7, illustrates exemplary STB types including AOLTV, WebTV and UltimateTV. Merely providing these STBs with a discoverable unique address would not identify the type of device.

Applicants respectfully submit all of the features of independent claims 1, 7, 11, and 15 are not described by the cited references and are therefore allowable. Dependent claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-14, and 16-20 are dependent from claims 1, 7, 11, and 15 and are therefore also allowable.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 577172002400.

Dated: February 13, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James M. Denaro

Registration No.: 54,063

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300

McLean, Virginia 22102

(703) 760-7739